REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on March 1, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Amendment, Applicants have editorially amended claims 1, 2, 6, 8 and 12 and cancelled claims 9 and 10 without prejudice. Claims 1 and 6 are the independent claims, and claims 1-8 and 11-13 are pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as anticipated by *Hulman* (US 5,367,242). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to Claim 1, the utilized reference, *Hulman* (US 5,367,242) refers to a "System For Charging A Rechargeable Battery Of A Portable Unit In A Rack" and discloses "A system for charging a rechargeable battery of a portable unit in a rack. The system has circuitry for transferring of energy from a supply circuit of the rack via a charging circuit of the unit to the battery. The transfer circuit is formed by an induction path which comprises a coil of the rack and a coil of the unit".

Nevertheless, the cited patent fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature of "a plurality of second induction modules located with a plurality of relative charge batteries in an integrated manner wherein the second induction modules transform an induction magnetic field generated by the first induction module to induction voltage, the second induction modules including different

relative induction coils with different numbers of turns set individually according to a required charge voltage of various charge batteries so that induction voltages meeting requirements of various charge batteries are generated" and hence, cannot provided the advantage that "one charge dock can charge multiple batteries at various required voltages according to battery specifications".

In contrast, with regard to Claim 1, the instant application "An Integrated Induction Battery Charge Apparatus" has been amended to include the abovementioned features that *Hulman* (US 5,367,242) does not disclose. In light of the foregoing amendments, the present claim 1 recites "a plurality of second induction modules located with a plurality of relative charge batteries in an integrated manner", and further that "one charge dock can charge multiple number of batteries at various required voltages according to battery specifications". Therefore, from the above submissions, claim 1 patentably defines over the cited patent.

With regard to claim 6, this recites that "the induction module being provided with an induction coil having a number of turns selected such that a required charge voltage of a specific type of the charge battery is generated from a value of magnetic field of the magnetic energy transferred from the charge end, the value of magnetic field being fixed irrespective of the specific type of the charge battery". This is also not taught or suggested by *Hulman* (US 5,367,242), that is, as per claim 1, *Hulman* does not teach that different batteries have

different numbers of turns associated therewith while the charge end always supplies the same magnetic field.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 11 and 12 are dependent from claims 1 and 6, and are allowable for at least the reasons that those claims are allowable, and claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 4, 5, 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as obvious over the combination of *Hulman* with *Kuennen et al.* (US 6,825,620). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as obvious over the combination of *Hulman* with *Burton et al.* (US 6,917,182). Although claim10 has been cancelled without prejudice, similar features are now recited in claim 6, and this rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Kuennen et al. (US 6,825,620) refers to an "Inductively Coupled Ballast Circuit" in which " A ballast circuit is disclosed for inductively providing power to a load. The ballast circuit includes an oscillator, a driver, a switching circuit, a resonant tank circuit and a current sensing circuit".

Burton et al. refers to a "Method And System For Providing Induction Charging Having Improved Efficiency" which discloses " A battery charging system for use with an induction charger. The battery charging system can include a secondary coil having a plurality of turns for receiving magnetic flux produced by a primary coil of the induction charger".

With regard to Claim10, this claim has been cancelled without prejudice, but similar features are now recited in claim 6 which reads in pertinent part "the induction module being provided with an induction coil having a number of turns selected such that a required charge voltage of a specific type of the charge battery is generated from a value of magnetic field of the magnetic energy transferred from the charge end, the value of magnetic field being fixed irrespective of the specific type of the charge battery". This feature is not taught or suggested by any of the references asserted in the Office Action, whether taken separately or in combination.

With regard to claims 4, 5 and 13, these claims are allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent from claim 1 or 6, and that *Kuennen et al.* fails to supply the deficiency of *Hulman*.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

May 31, 2006
Date

Alun L. Palmer – Reg. No. 47,838
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924; 202-408-5297
Telephone: 202-371-8976

ALP